

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1 through 4, 14 through 19 have been cancelled. Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Claims 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 20 have been amended. Claims 5 through 13, 16 and 20 through 23 remain in the application. Re-examination and reconsideration of the application as amended are requested.

Claim 5 has been amended. In claim 5 element b the words "at least four" have been added. The word "flat" before the word "bottom" has been deleted. The word "which" has been replaced with the words "and that enclosed structure has inner and an outer sides and". Basis for this is found in the specification on page 10 lines 12 through 16 and Figure 3. In element e the words "the inner sides of three or more inner" have been add before the word "sides". Basis for this is found in the specification on page 10 lines 12 through 16 and Figure 3.

Claims 8, 9, and 12 have been amended. Before the word "container" the words "inner sides of the" have been added.

Claims 11 has been amended. In element a of claim 11, the words "with inner and outer sides and" after the word "structure" have been added. Basis for this is found in the specification on page 10 lines 12 through 16 and Figure 3. In claim 11 element c the words "inner sides of three or more

inner" have been added before the words "sides". Basis for this is found in the specification on page 10 lines 12 through 16 and Figure 3.

Claim 13 has been amended. In claim 13 the word "releasable" has been changed to "releasably" and the word "inner" has been added before the word "pouches" and "sides".

Claim 16 has been amended. In claim 16 the word "inner" has been added before the word "sides."

Claim 20 is now dependant on claim 5 rather than 14.

Claims 21 and 22 have been added. They read as follows:

21. (new) A purse as in claim 5 further comprising:

a. the container has more than four inner sides.

22. (new) A purse as in claim 11 further comprising:

a. the container has more than four inner sides.

Basis for this is found in the specification on page 10 lines 12 through 16 and Figure 3.

The examiner has rejected claim 5, 7-13, 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable of Siegel in view of either Kohn or Frakas. Applicant transverses this statement.

Applicant has amended claim 5. Element e of claim 5 now reads: "e. a means to releasably attach the inner pouches to the inner sides of three or more inner sides of the container." Siegel shows the pouches being

attached to only two inner sides. Kohn and Farkas do not show any pouches being attached. Also in reading through these patents there is no suggestion or teaching that the pouches can be attached to three or more sides. Thus Claim 5 is now patentable over Siegel in view Kohn or Farkas. Claims 6 through 10 are dependant on claim 5. Thus the same argument that applies to claim 5 also applies to claim 6 through 10.

Claim 11 has been amended. Element c of claim 11 now reads: "a means for releasably attaching the pouches to the inner sides of three or more inner sides of the container." As pointed out above, Siegel shows the pouches being attached to only two inner sides, and Kohn and Farkas do not show any pouches being attached. Thus claim 11 is clearly patentable over Siegel in view Kohn or Farkas. Claims 12, 13, and 16 are dependant on claim 11, therefore, the same argument that make claim 11 patentable makes claims 12, 13 and 16 patentable. Claim 15 has been canceled

The examiner has rejected claims 6, 14, 18 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable of Siegel in view of either Kohn or Frakas and further in view of Cantor. Applicant transverses this statement.

Applicant states that claims 6 and 20 are dependant on claim 5. Cantor does not show any inner pouches. As pointed out above, Siegel shows the pouches being attached to only two inner sides, and Kohn and

Farkas do not show any pouches being attached. Thus, Siegel shows the pouches being attached to only two inner sides, and Kohn, Farkas, and Cantor does not show any inner pouches being attached. Thus claim 5 would be clearly patentable over Siegel in view of Kohn, Farkas, and Cantor. Therefore, since claims 6 and 20 are dependant on claim 5, claims 6 and 20 are patentable over Siegel in view of Kohn, Farkas, and Cantor. Claims 14 and 18 have been canceled.

Claim 21 and 22 have been added. Claim 21 and 22 read as follows:


- 21. (new) A purse as in claim 5 further comprising:
 - a. the container has more than four inner sides.
- 22. (new) A purse as in claim 11 further comprising:
 - a. the container has more than four inner sides.

As pointed out above claims 5 and 11 are patentable over Siegel in view of Kohn and Farkas. Cantor does not show any inner pouches being attached. Thus claims 5 and 11 are patentable over Siegel in view of Kohn, Farkas, and Cantor. Therefore claims 21 and 22 would also be patentable over Siegel in view of Kohn, Farkas, and Cantor for the same reason. Also Siegel, Kohn and Farkas show containers with four or less inner sides. Cantor does not show a container that fits in a purse. Claims 21 and 22 call for containers with more than four inner sides, clearly claims 21 and 22 are patentable over Siegel in view of Kohn, Farkas, and Cantor.

Furthermore, it is believed the claims as amended define an invention which is unobvious over US patents to Segal, Rosen, Kohn, Farkas, Cantor or all other patent put forth by the examiner taken singularly or in combination. None of these references put forth the specific combination cited in the claims. None of these reference show inter pouches that attach to three or more inner sides of the container.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection and objections is requested. Allowance of Claims 5 through 13, 16 and 20 through 23 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jerry Seiner
~~Attorney at Law~~
617 Croghan Street
Fremont, Ohio 43420
419-332-2221
#33,087